

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3 and 6-23 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12, 14, 18-20, and 22-23 stand finally rejected. Claims 11, 13, 15-17, and 21 have been objected to, but indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Following entry of the amendment, claims 1-3, 6-8, 11, 15, 21, and 23 will have been canceled; claims 9, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 20 will have been amended; and claims 24-31 will have been added.

The claim amendments place the claims in condition for allowance, based on the subject matter that the Examiner has found to be allowable. The following is an explanation of the claim amendments and added claims, and the support for the claims. No new matter is added by the amendment.

- Independent claim 9 has been amended to incorporate the features of claim 11
- Claim 13 has been amended to incorporate its base claims (9 and 12)
- Independent claim 14 has been amended to incorporate the features of claim 15
- Claims 16 and 17 (previously dependent on canceled claim 15) have been amended to make them each dependent on claim 14
- Independent claim 20 has been amended to incorporate the features of claim 21
- New dependent claim 24 recites the features of dependent claim 10, but with dependency on claim 13. (Claims 10 is dependent on claim 9; since claim 13 now recites the features of the prior version of claim 9, it is appropriate to have a dependent claim with this feature based on the new version of claim 13 as well.)
- New independent claim 25 is a computer-readable medium form of the current version of independent method claim 13. The use of computer-readable medium to store instructions for performing a method is supported at least by paragraph 0021 and FIG. 1 of the original specification.
- New dependent claim 26 is dependent on claim 25. It recites the feature from claims 10 and 24, as discussed above.
- New claims 27-31 recite an encryption feature that was originally presented in now-canceled claim 7. It is supported at least by paragraph 0030 of the original specification, as well as by original claim 7.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-2786/305794.1  
**Application No.:** 10/721,562  
**Office Action Dated:** May 14, 2007

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

Interview summary

The claim amendments presented here were submitted to the Examiner by fax. A telephone interview was held between the Examiner and patent practitioner Peter M. Ullman on July 10, 2007, based on the fax submitted. The Examiner agreed that the amendments appear to incorporate the subject matter found allowable into independent claims, and therefore should result in allowance of the case. The Examiner also indicated that if he discovers any minor informalities in the claims as presented, these would be addressed subsequently by telephone call and an Examiner's Amendment.

In the interview, the applicability of the Challenger reference to the prior version of the independent claims was discussed. No agreement was reached as to this point.

Applicants submit that the foregoing summary satisfies any requirement to summarize the interview under 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b).

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, applicants submit that this case is now in condition for allowance. If any minor issues remain (e.g., as any informalities of language), applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned so that the issues can be resolved quickly.

Date: August 14, 2007

/Steven B. Samuels/  
Steven B. Samuels  
Registration No. 37,711

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439